Vigiliae Christianae 24 (1970) 241-260; © *North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam*

A HELLENISTIC CONTEXT FOR JOHN 10, 29

BY

JOHN WHITTAKER

The text of the first part of John 10, 29 is, as C. K. Barrett has put it,[1] "in confusion", and in spite of Barrett's discussion and, more recently, that of J. N. Birdsall[2] the confusion has hardly been dispelled. The most attractive reading on internal grounds, Barrett readily admits, is ὁ πατήρ μου ὃς δέδωκέν μοι πάντων μείζων ἐστίν. This is the text, the antiquity of which is now attested by Papyrus Bodmer II (P 66),[3] favoured by R. Bultmann[4] and C. H. Dodd.[5] But Barrett argues – and Birdsall follows him in this – that "it is impossible to explain how this excellent reading came to be changed into the difficult ὃ ... μεῖζον",[6] and instead supports the reading of Θ: ὃς ... μεῖζον. Birdsall, however, accuses Barrett of "temerity" in "accepting a reading from a codex written by a scribe who was poorly acquainted with Greek",[7] gives his own support to the reading of ℵ Ψ L W – ὃ ... μείζων – and adopts Barrett's translation thereof: "My Father in regard to what He has given me is greater than all." It should be added, in order to complete the picture, that Barrett had translated ὃ ... μείζων only in order to reject it as "a very difficult reading". And indeed this bold use of a relative clause, without antecedent, to limit the meaning of an adjectival predicate would be unique in NT Greek and not easy to parallel elsewhere. For this reason ὃ ...

---

[1] *The Gospel according to St. John* (London 1955) p. 317.

[2] John X. 29, *Journal of Theological Studies* 11 (1960) 342ff.

[3] P. Bodmer XV (P 75) is unfortunately defective at this crucial point: ὃς ... μει[..]ν.

[4] *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (Göttingen 1941) p. 294 n. 4.

[5] *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge 1953) p. 433 n. 1.

[6] Cf. also J. N. Sanders and B. A. Mastin, *The Gospel according to St. John* (London 1968) p. 256 n. 8: "For ὃ and μεῖζον most authorities, including P 66 fam 1 fam 13 sin pesh hl sah, have ὅς and μείζων (masculine). These give excellent sense, but make it impossible to account for the harder reading, which is to be preferred."

[7] *Op. cit.*, p. 342. In fact ὃς ... μεῖζον is also the reading of *inter alia* A!

μείζων is not fairly described by Birdsall as "a perfectly acceptable Greek sentence".[8]

But if ὃ ... μείζων seems 'ungriechisch' Barrett's ὃς ... μεῖζον is hardly better. For, unless Barrett is right, there is not a single instance in the NT of the application of a neuter adjectival predicate to a singular personal (masculine or feminine) subject.[9] Certainly the parallels to ὃς

[8] *Op. cit.*, p. 344. The fact that Birdsall's interpretation of ὃ ... μείζων places an intolerable limitation upon the power of the Father should not be lightly disregarded. Birdsall claims (*loc. cit.*) that this "apparent limitation ... may be no more than an accident of phrasing".

[9] The variety of incongruous neuter predicate to which I refer should not be confused with any of the following:

(1) The predicative use of the singular neuter adjective in statements of general validity; cf., e.g., *Iliad* II, 204 οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη. Blass-Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*[12] (Göttingen 1965) para. 131, claim that this construction does not occur in the NT, but cf. Matt. 6, 25 = Luke 12, 23 (οὐχὶ ἡ ψυχὴ πλεῖόν ἐστιν τῆς τροφῆς;) where the adjectival character of πλεῖον is surely (*pace* Blass-Debrunner) obvious; Matt. 6, 34 (ἀρκετὸν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἡ κακία αὐτῆς); II Corinth. 2, 6 (ἱκανὸν τῷ τοιούτῳ ἡ ἐπιτιμία αὕτη). The two latter examples are clearly (again *pace* Blass-Debrunner) general statements, and though ἀρκετόν and ἱκανόν might here be regarded as indeclinable equivalents of *satis* (as seems to be the case with ἱκανόν at Luke 22, 38) ἀρκετός is certainly declinable at I Peter 4, 3.

(2) The use of neuter pronominal predicates with personal subjects, as at I Corinth. 9, 22 (τοῖς πᾶσιν γέγονα πάντα); *ibid.* 15, 10 (εἰμι ὅ εἰμι); Galat. 6, 3 (εἰ γὰρ δοκεῖ τις εἶναί τι μηδὲν ὤν); cf. Blass-Debrunner, para. 131 f. John 8, 25 (τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅτι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν) is not a case in point. Barrett's interpretation (*op. cit.*, p. 283 f: "I am from the beginning what I tell you") is impossible if for no other reason than that (τὴν) ἀρχήν, when used as a temporal adverb, seems always to mean "in the beginning" (as opposed to later) and never "from the beginning". In John 8, 25 the phrase is used in a virtually negative sentence to mean "at all" ("Why do I speak to you at all?"); cf. Ps.-Clement, *Hom.* 6, 11, PG 2, 205 εἰ μὴ παρακολουθεῖς οἷς λέγω, τί καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν διαλέγομαι;

(3) The collective use of the neuter singular with reference to persons, as at John 17, 24 (Πατήρ, ὃ δέδωκάς μοι, θέλω ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ κἀκεῖνοι ὦσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ); cf. Blass-Debrunner, para. 138, 1.

(4) The substantival use of the neuter adjective, either with the definite article, as at Acts 17, 29 (τὸ θεῖον), or without, as at Mark 4, 22 (ἵνα ἔλθῃ εἰς φανερόν); cf. Blass-Debrunner, para. 263 f.

(5) The type of transition from masculine or feminine to neuter and *vice versa* (frequently though not exclusively through the medium of the substantival use of the neuter adjective preceded by the article) which facilitates the identification of personal deity and impersonal philosophical principle and in consequence plays an important role in Hellenistic theologies. For a NT instance of this phenomenon cf. Acts 17, 23 ff. (ὃ οὖν ἀγνοοῦντες εὐσεβεῖτε, τοῦτο ἐγὼ καταγγέλλω ὑμῖν. κτλ.). F. F. Bruce (*The Acts of the Apostles* (London 1952) p. 336) comments: "Paul starts with his hearers' belief in an impersonal divine essence, pantheistically conceived, and leads them to the Living God revealed as Creator and Judge." Cf. also I John 1, 1 ff. I have drawn attention to other instances of this category of transition in my paper Ammonius on the Delphic E, *Classical Quarterly* 19 (1969) 185 ff.

... μεῖζον cited by Barrett are more apparent than real. Thus the veiled language of Matt. 12, 6 (λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῦ ἱεροῦ μεῖζόν ἐστιν ὧδε) and Matt. 12, 41 f. = Luke 11, 31 f. (... καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ ὧδε ... καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Σολομῶνος ὧδε) offers no counterpart since in none of these instances is there a personal subject of which a neuter adjective is predicated – Jesus is not made to say ἐγώ εἰμι πλεῖον Σολομῶνος. Again, at John 10, 30 we read not ἐγώ εἰμι ἕν or ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐστι but ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν.[10] Since εἷς μία ἕν (which is in any case pronominal in character rather than adjectival) necessarily lacks plural forms, a true concord of subject and predicate is in this instance out of the question and the neuter singular the only correct possibility.[11] That this is the case is only confirmed by the solecism of Galat. 3, 28: πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς[12] ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. The offensive εἷς has already been removed from the text in P 46, whilst Patristic writers generally replace εἷς with the more appropriate ἕν in their citations of this text. Finally, it may be worth emphasizing that there is no pronounced tendency in the NT towards the use of discordant neuter adjectival predicates in sentences of a non-general nature.[13] In addition to possible instances already mentioned I have noted only the following: Matt. 19, 4 = Mark 10, 6 = LXX Genesis 1, 27 (ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς)[14]; John 19, 11 (οὐκ εἶχες ἐξουσίαν κατ' ἐμοῦ οὐδεμίαν εἰ μὴ ἦν δεδομένον σοι ἄνωθεν); Acts 12, 3 in D (ἰδὼν δὲ ὅτι ἀρεστόν ἐστιν

[10] Cf. also John 11, 52; 17, 11 and 21–23; I Corinth. 3, 8 and 11, 5; Ephes. 2, 14. But cf., e.g., Galat. 3, 20: ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἷς ἐστιν.

[11] Cf. footnote 9 (2) above. On the use of the neuter form ἕν to express identity see Aristotle, *Metaph.* 1015 b 16 ff., in particular 1016 a 24 ff.: λέγεται δ' ἓν καὶ ὧν τὸ γένος ἓν διαφέρον ταῖς ἀντικειμέναις διαφοραῖς ... (οἷον ἵππος ἄνθρωπος κύων ἕν τι ὅτι πάντα ζῷα). Cf. further, e.g., Plato, *Polit.* 259 D 3 f.: Τὴν ἄρα πολιτικὴν καὶ πολιτικὸν καὶ βασιλικὴν καὶ βασιλικὸν εἰς ταὐτὸν ὡς ἓν πάντα ταῦτα συνθήσομεν.

[12] I wonder in fact if εἷς might not here be regarded as indeclinable as at Mark 14, 19; John 8, 9 and Rev. 21, 21.

[13] It should not be forgotten that incongruous neuter adjectival predicates occur in non-general sentences even in Classical Greek (cf. Kühner-Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*[4] I (Leverkusen 1955) pp. 58 f., and E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* II (Munich 1950) pp. 605 f.), but not, of course, when the subject is an individual person. Thus, if Stobaeus' version of Euripides, *Hipp.* 443 (Κύπρις γὰρ οὐ φορητὸν (-τὸς codd.) ἦν πολλὴ ῥυῇ) is correct, then the neuter form φορητόν is explained by the fact that, as W. S. Barrett remarks in his commentary (Oxford 1964), "Κύπρις here is no real individual but merely a name for sexual desire".

[14] A literal translation, preserving even the word-order of the Hebrew, with neuter singulars to replace the singular adjectives of the original. The result is, however, not unclassical; see LSJ[9] s. vv. ἄρσην and θῆλυς. Cf. also Galat. 3, 28 (οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ), to which Hellenistic literature offers innumerable parallels.

τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἡ ἐπιχείρησις αὐτοῦ); I John 2, 8 (ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν, ὅ ἐστιν ἀληθές).[15] At Rev. 12,5 (ἔτεκεν υἱὸν ἄρσεν, ὅς ...) υἱόν and ἄρσεν are in apposition (cf. Blass-Debrunner, para. 136, 3); however, it is indicative of the strong sense, even in the Hellenistic age, of the need for congruence in the case of adjectives applied to nouns denoting persons that even here a wide variety of authorities from P 47 onwards have substituted in place of ἄρσεν the masculine form of the adjective.

The above considerations cast serious doubt on the reading ὃς ... μεῖζον and give firm grounds for assuming (since the substitution of o for ω and *vice versa* is one of the most common of scribal errors) that if ὃς is correct then μεῖζον is in origin simply a transcriptional mistake for μείζων. It is left to us then to choose between the neuter formulation ὃ ... μεῖζον and the masculine ὃς ... μείζων. The choice is not difficult to make, for, as Barrett points out, "If ... we accept the neuter reading, it is difficult to attach a meaning to the sentence and impossible to fit it into the context. The sentence will run; As to my Father, what he has given me is greater than all, and no one can snatch... The *nominativus pendens* is Johannine; but what is the Father's gift to the Son? The context suggests the sheep, but these cannot be said to be greater than all".

However, before we conclude in favour of ὃς ... μείζων we must consider the objection raised against this reading by Barrett and others that "it is impossible to explain how this excellent reading came to be changed into the difficult ὃ ... μεῖζον". In reply to this claim one can only point out that the transition from ὃς ... μείζων to ὃ ... μείζων or ὃ ... μεῖζον is in fact well within the bounds of transcriptional probability. In the case of the transition to ὃ ... μείζων it is not difficult to conceive the scribe as motivated, whether consciously or unconsciously, by the desire to provide an explicit object to δέδωκε. The notion of the Father giving to the Son, it may be recalled, occurs with particular frequency in John,[16] but if ὃς ... μείζων is correct then 10, 29 is one of the few instances in this gospel (other examples are 14, 27 and 16, 23) in which δίδωμι occurs without an expressed grammatical object. It is surely difficult to deny the possibility of a scribe failing to note that the object

[15] In this last instance the neuter is not strictly predicative but may nevertheless be considered relevant to our inquiry.

[16] Cf., e.g., John 5, 36 (ἃ δέδωκέν μοι ὁ πατήρ), 6, 37 (ὃ δίδωσίν μοι ὁ πατήρ), 6, 39 (ὃ δέδωκέν μοι), 17, 2 (ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ), 17, 4 (ὃ δέδωκάς μοι), 17, 9 (περὶ ὧν δέδωκάς μοι), 17, 24 (πατήρ, ὃ δέδωκάς μοι), 18, 11 (ὃ δέδωκέν μοι ὁ πατήρ).

of δέδωκε (αὐτά = πρόβατα)[17] was to be supplied from the previous sentence and in consequence succumbing to the urge to bring the language of 10, 29 into line with formulations occurring elsewhere in the gospel by substituting ὅ for ὅς. Whether the deterioration from μείζων to μεῖζον (which latter form could only be understood as predicative to the object of δέδωκε) was in any way responsible for this substitution or was a product thereof, or perhaps a completely independent transcriptional error, it is probably impossible on the basis of the presently available evidence to decide. But one might reasonably suspect rather that the transition to μεῖζον (a mere orthographical slip) has preceded and provoked the alteration of ὅς to ὅ than the scribe has altered ὅς to ὅ in front of μείζων at the expense of the logic of the sentence as a whole. This, however, is a matter of only secondary interest. The important fact is that at whatever point in the tradition the variant μεῖζον emerged the transition from ὅς to ὅ is fully explicable in terms of transcriptional probability. In consequence of which consideration it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the original reading was, as near as we can ascertain,[18] ὁ πατήρ μου ὃς δέδωκέν μοι πάντων μείζων ἐστίν.

For the remainder of this paper I turn to a feature of John 10, 29 which has, I think, escaped the attention of commentators but which certainly merits consideration. It is remarkable that the combination πάντων μείζων[19] appears to have been a Hellenistic liturgical formula or ἐπίκλησις. As such it occurs in a famous magical papyrus at Leiden in a prayer which opens as follows (PGM XIII, 63 ff.):

ἐπικαλοῦμαί σε τὸν πάντων μείζονα, τὸν πάντα κτίσαντα, σὲ τὸν αὐτογέννητον, τὸν πάντα ὁρῶντα καὶ μὴ ὁρώμενον· σὺ γὰρ ἔδωκας ἡλίῳ τὴν δόξαν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν ἅπασαν, σελήνην αὔξειν καὶ ἀπολήγειν καὶ δρόμους ἔχειν τακτούς, μηδὲν ἀφαιρήσας τοῦ προγενεστέρου σκότους, ἀλλ' ἰσότητα αὐτῶν ἐμέρισας· σοῦ γὰρ φανέντος καὶ κόσμος ἐγένετο καὶ φῶς ἐφάνη. σοὶ πάντα ὑποτέτακται, οὗ οὐδεὶς θεῶν δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν ἀληθινὴν μορφήν. ὁ μεταμορφούμενος εἰς πάντας, ἀόρατος εἶ Αἰὼν Αἰῶνος.[20]

---

[17] The object of δέδωκεν ("them") has been made explicit in the Sahidic version, as also already in P. Bodmer III. In P 75 the size of the lacuna between εδωκε[ν μοι and παν]των μει[ζο]ν suggests that here too an explicit object to the verb of giving has been introduced into the text – presumably αὐτά, or even πάντα (cf. K. Aland, Neue neutestamentliche Papyri II, *New Testament Studies* 11 (1964-65) 19).

[18] In particular the following uncertainties should be noted: μου is not universally attested; P 66 and P 75 read ἔδωκεν; the tradition is divided as to whether μείζων should precede or follow πάντων.

[19] Or μείζων πάντων. The order of the terms would not affect the formularic character of the whole.

[20] The text is translated and commented upon by A.J. Festugière, *La révélation*

I quote this prayer (which reoccurs with slight variations at PGM XIII, 570 ff. and is referred to by its *incipit* at PGM XIII, 688 ff.: γράψας ... τὴν στήλην, ἧς ἡ ἀρχή· 'ἐπικαλοῦμαί σε, τὸν πάντων μείζονα') at such length because it contains clear indications of Hellenistic Jewish ancestry. Thus, the term αὐτογέν‹ν›ητος[21] is particularly suited to the unfathered God of the Jews, and indeed its Jewish associations are well attested. The term is applied to God in the *Sibylline Oracles* (VIII, 429), whilst Ps.-Justin quotes an oracle, apparently popularly ascribed to Apollo at Delphi, as follows (*Cohort.* 11, PG 6, 264): ἐρομένου γάρ τινος, ὡς αὐτοί (sc. the Greeks) φατε, τοῦ παρ' ὑμῖν χρηστηρίου τίνας συνέβη θεοσεβεῖς ἄνδρας γεγενῆσθαί ποτε, οὕτω τὸ χρηστήριον εἰρηκέναι φατέ·

> Μοῦνοι Χαλδαῖοι σοφίην λάχον, ἠδ' ἄρ' Ἑβραῖοι,
> αὐτογένητον ἄνακτα σεβαζόμενοι θεὸν ἁγνῶς.[22]

This oracle also appears in Cyril of Alexandria (*Adv. Iul.* V, PG 76, 776), and with αὐτογένεθλον for αὐτογένητον in Porphyry's *De phil. ex orac. haur.* (p. 141 Wolff) = Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* IX, 10, PG 21, 697,[23] as well as at Eusebius, *Demonstr. Evang.* III, 3, PG 22, 189. In

---

d'Hermès Trismégiste IV, *Le Dieu inconnu et la Gnose* (Paris 1954) pp. 194 f.

[21] On the fluctuation in the spelling of γενητός, γεννητός and their compounds see G. L. Prestige, *God in Patristic Thought* (rp. London 1964) pp. 37 ff.

[22] At *Cohort.* 21, PG 6, 285 Ps.-Justin apparently wrote αὐτόν in place of ἁγνῶς.

[23] *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (ed. Lampe) s.v. αὐτογένεθλος lists this reference incorrectly and mistakenly suggests Choirilus as the source of the oracle. For αὐτογένεθλος, αὐτογενής, αὐτογέν‹ν›ητος and αὐτοφυής in Gnostic and early Christian theologies see *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* s.vv. It may be added that the term αὐτογένητος occurs frequently in the *Apocryphon of John* (pp. 30–35 in P. Berol. 8502), and that all these terms, as well as αὐτοπάτωρ, are well represented in the *Anonymous Gnostic Writing* of the *Codex Brucianus* (cf. C. Schmidt, *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften* I, 3. Aufl. v. W. Till, GCS Bd. 45 (Berlin 1962), Wortregister s.vv.). In the *Oracula Chaldaica* (p. 25 Kroll) the πατρικὸς νόος was described as αὐτογένεθλος, whilst Porphyry (*Hist. phil.* fr. 18 Nauck) used the terms αὐτογέννητος, αὐτοπάτωρ and αὐτογόνως of the eternal procession of νοῦς from the first god: προῆλθε δὲ προαιώνιος ἀπ' αἰτίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὡρμημένος, αὐτογέννητος ὢν καὶ αὐτοπάτωρ· οὐ γὰρ ἐκείνου κινουμένου πρὸς γένεσιν τὴν τούτου ἡ πρόοδος γέγονεν, ἀλλὰ τούτου παρελθόντος αὐτογόνως ἐκ θεοῦ. For αὐτογένεθλος cf. further the *Theosophia Tubingensis*, p. 107, 18 (quoted below) and 109, 10 Buresch. Other terms similarly used of the deity as *causa sui* are αὐταίτιος, αὐτογενέτωρ, αὐτολόχευτος, αὐτοπάρακτος, αὐτόσπορος (cf. *Theos. Tub.* p. 107, 18 Buresch αὐτὸς ἄναξ πάντων, αὐτόσπορος, αὐτογένεθλος), αὐτόσσυτος (Synesius, *Hymn.* IX, 52 Terzaghi; not listed in *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*), αὐτόφυτος (Nonnus, *Paraphr. in Jo.* I, 1, PG 43, 749; not listed in *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*). *Const. apost.* VI, 11, PG 1, 936 indicates that some Christian circles regarded terms of this type as Gnostic and in consequence rejected them: οὐκ αὐταίτιον καὶ αὐτογένεθλον (sc. τὸν πατέρα), ὡς ἐκείνοι (sc. the followers of Simon Magus) οἴονται,

place of αὐτογένητος the term αὐτοφυής occurs in Book III of the *Sibylline Oracles* in a passage which also in other respects bears marked resemblances to the prayer in PGM XIII (*Orac. Sib.* III, 11f.; 17ff.):

> εἷς θεός ἐστι μόναρχος ἀθέσφατος αἰθέρι ναίων
> αὐτοφυὴς ἀόρατος ὁρώμενος αὐτὸς ἅπαντα·
> .....
> τίς γὰρ θνητὸς ἐὼν κατιδεῖν δύναται θεὸν ὅσσοις;
> ἢ τίς χωρήσει κἂν τοὔνομα μοῦνον ἀκοῦσαι
> οὐρανίου μεγάλοιο θεοῦ κόσμον κρατέοντος;
> ὃς λόγῳ ἔκτισε πάντα καὶ οὐρανὸν ἠδὲ θάλασσαν
> ἠέλιόν τ' ἀκάμαντα σελήνην τε πλήθουσαν
> ἄστρα τε λαμπετόωντα, κραταιὰν μητέρα Τηθύν,

ἀλλ' ἀίδιον καὶ ἄναρχον. Cf. further Ps.-Clement, *Recogn.* III, 3, 8ff., GCS, *Pseudoklement.* II, p. 97, 8ff. (PG I, 1283): *ingeniti autem appellatio non quid sit, nobis intellegere dat, sed quod non est factus; autopatora[n] vero et autogeneton, hoc est ipsum sibi patrem ipsumque sibi filium qui vocaverunt illud quod est ingenitum, contumeliam facere conati sunt dubiis deservientes rationibus*; III, 4, 2f., GCS, *ibid.* II, p. 98, 6ff. (PG 1, 1283); III, 11, 1ff., GCS, *ibid.* II, p. 105, 15ff. (PG 1, 1287f.). The term ἀλόχευτος is used of Dionysus in an inscription, dating from the first half of the third century after Christ, from the Dolicheneum at Dura (cf. H. N. Porter, A Bacchic Graffito from the Dolicheneum at Dura, *American Journal of Philology* 69 (1948) 27ff.), and in all probability, according to Porter (*op. cit.*, p. 32), refers not to the fact that Dionysus was "born in a manner other than the usual manner" (cf. ἀλόχευτος at Colluthus, *De rapt. Hel.* 182), but to his being ungenerated or self-produced (cf. Synesius, *Hymn.* IX, 54 Terzaghi). Porter rules out the former interpretation on the ground that (*loc. cit.*), "The initiates in Dura did not have the interest in or knowledge of mythology and etymology possessed by Nonnus and Colluthus". However, since even at Dura some knowledge of the mythology of Dionysus would be essential to the existence of his cult, Porter's argument does not convince entirely. On αὐτοπάτωρ and ἀλόχευτος see also A. Cameron's note (to which I am indebted) Gregory of Nazianzus and Apollo, *Journal of Theological Studies* 20 (1969) 240f. Since terms of the above type play no significant role in Philo, it seems reasonable to regard them as a relatively late development. However, it should be noted that the term αὐτόγονος, or some equivalent may have been used of the physical universe by the Early Academic Crantor in his commentary on the *Timaeus*; cf. Proclus, *In Tim.* I, 277, 8ff. Diehl: οἱ δὲ περὶ Κράντορα τοῦ Πλάτωνος ἐξηγηταί φασι γενητὸν λέγεσθαι τὸν κόσμον ὡς ἀπ' αἰτίας ἄλλης παραγόμενον καὶ οὐκ ὄντα αὐτόγονον οὐδὲ αὐθυπόστατον. The presence of the term αὐθυπόστατος shows that Proclus is paraphrasing Crantor's argument rather than quoting him *verbatim*; cf. H. Dörrie, Ὑπόστασις: *Wort- und Bedeutungsgeschichte* (Nachr. d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl. 1955, Nr. 3), p. 67. Moreover the conception appears in full philosophical flower in a fragment of Chrysippus preserved in Philodemus, *De pietate* p. 80 Gomperz: ἅπαντα [τ'] ἐστὶν αἰθήρ, ὁ αὐτὸς ὢν καὶ πατὴρ καὶ υἱός, [ὡς] κἀν τῷ πρώτῳ μὴ μάχεσθαι τὸ τὴν Ῥέ[α]ν καὶ μητέρα [τοῦ] Διὸς εἶναι καὶ θ[υγα]τέρα. Relevant to the antiquity of the conception is also Plutarch, *De Iside* 376 A: τὴν μὲν γὰρ Ἶσιν πολλάκις τῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ὀνόματι καλοῦσι (sc. the Egyptians) φράζοντι τοιοῦτον λόγον "ἦλθον ἀπ' ἐμαυτῆς", ὅπερ ἐστὶν αὐτοκινήτου φορᾶς δηλωτικόν. For God as *causa sui* in a Stoic context see also Seneca, *Quaest. nat.* VII, 30, 3 (quoted on p. 253 below). On this topic see further Synesius, *Hymn.* I, 144ff. Terz., and Terzaghi's notes thereon.

πηγὰς καὶ ποταμούς, πῦρ ἄφθιτον, ἤματα, νύκτας,
κτλ.[24]

Here, as in the prayer in PGM XIII, we meet the theme of divine power and creativity combined with the conception of the unseen, all-seeing God. Also this latter conception has specifically Jewish associations. Cf. Matt. 6, 6 (ὁ πατήρ σου ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ) and *Leviticus Rabbah* 4, 8 ("Like God, the soul sees but is not seen"); further Philo, *De opific.* 69 (ὃν γὰρ ἔχει λόγον ὁ μέγας ἡγεμὼν ἐν ἅπαντι τῷ κόσμῳ, τοῦτον ὡς ἔοικε καὶ ὁ ἀνθρώπινος νοῦς ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ· ἀόρατός τε γάρ ἐστιν, αὐτὸς τὰ πάντα ὁρῶν), and *De leg. spec.* I, 18 (παγγέλοιον γὰρ οἴεσθαι, ὅτι ὁ μὲν νοῦς ὁ ἐν ἡμῖν βραχύτατος ὢν καὶ ἀόρατος ἡγεμὼν τῶν αἰσθητικῶν ὀργάνων ἐστίν, ὁ δὲ τοῦ πάντος ὁ μέγιστος καὶ τελειότατος οὐχὶ βασιλεὺς βασιλέων εἶναι πέφυκε, βλεπομένων οὐ βλεπόμενος).[25]

Strikingly similar to the prayer in PGM XIII is also *Orac. Sib.* fr. 1, 7ff.:

εἷς θεός, ὃς μόνος ἄρχει, ὑπερμεγέθης[26] ἀγένητος[27]
παντοκράτωρ ἀόρατος ὁρώμενος αὐτὸς ἅπαντα,
αὐτὸς δ' οὐ βλέπεται θνητῆς ὑπὸ σαρκὸς ἀπάσης.

A similar combination of ideas is also found in Ps.-Justin, *De mon.* 2, PG 6, 316, in a supposed Orphic poem (= *Orph.* fr. 245 Kern) deriving

[24] Cf. *Orac. Sib.* IV, 12ff.:
ὃς καθορῶν ἅμα πάντας ὑπ' οὐδενὸς αὐτὸς ὁρᾶται.
The continuation dwells upon the creative activities of the deity.

[25] The analogy between the soul and the unseen deity also appears in popular Stoicism; cf. Ps.-Aristotle, *De mundo* 399 b 11ff. Although it may be supposed that nothing escapes the notice of Zeus (cf., e.g., Hesiod, *Opera* 267 πάντα ἰδὼν Διὸς ὀφθαλμὸς καὶ πάντα νοήσας), it is in Greek tradition the preeminently visible sun that is commonly thought of as observing and taking note of everything (cf., e.g., *Iliad* III, 277 'Ηελιός θ', ὃς πάντ' ἐφορᾷς καὶ πάντ' ἐπακούεις). But though the sun may be visible, it is dangerous to stare at it. *Orac. Sib.* fr. 1, 10ff., following Xenophon, *Mem.* IV, 3, 14, points out that since the human eye cannot even gaze at the sun without suffering damage, man is *a fortiori* incapable of beholding God – an argument that made considerable appeal to Hellenistic Jewish and early Christian writers (cf. Geffcken *ad loc.*).

[26] Cf. *Acta Joannis* 79 (II[1], 190, 14f. Lipsius-Bonnet): τὸν μόνον θεόν σε ὄντα ἐπικαλοῦμαι τὸν ὑπερμεγέθη, τὸν ἄφραστον, κτλ.; Philo, *Leg. alleg.* III, 82: τὸ μὴ ταπεινῶς καὶ χαμαιζήλως ὑπερμεγέθως δὲ καὶ ὑπεραύλως καὶ ὑψηλῶς νοεῖν περὶ θεοῦ ἔμφασιν τοῦ ὑψίστου κινεῖ. Ephes. 1, 19 speaks of τὸ ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ. Rather different is *Corpus Hermeticum* I, 1 (I, 7, 5ff. N-F) ἔδοξά τινα ὑπερμεγέθη μέτρῳ ἀπεριορίστῳ τυγχάνοντα καλεῖν μου τὸ ὄνομα καὶ λέγοντά μοι, ... Cf. Nock-Festugière *ad loc.*

[27] This does not necessarily imply that God is not *causa sui*; cf. *Orac. Sib.* fr. 1, 17: αὐτογενὴς ἀγένητος ἅπαντα κρατῶν διὰ παντός.

from a Jewish propaganda source[28] which listed, after the fashion of a γνωμολογία, texts (mostly forged, but some genuine) under the names of authors of the classical age in support of Jewish beliefs and practices:

> εἷς ἔστ' αὐτογενής, ἑνὸς ἔκγονα πάντα τέτεκται·
> ἐν δ' αὐτοῖς αὐτὸς περιγίγνεται, οὐδέ τις αὐτὸν
> εἰσοράᾳ θνητῶν, αὐτὸς δέ γε πάντας ὁρᾶται.

These verses also occur, with slight variations, in Clement of Alexandria (*Protr.* VII, PG 8, 184 = *Orph.* fr. 246 Kern), in Ps.-Justin (*Cohort.* 15, PG 6, 269), in Cyril of Alexandria (*Adv. Iul.* I, 25, PG 76, 541), in the *Theosophia Tubingensis* c. 56, p. 113, 2ff. Buresch, and with αὐτοτελής in place of αὐτογενής (no doubt in reaction against the concept of self-creation; cf. footnote 23) in Ps.-Aristobulus (Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* XIII, 12, PG 21, 1100 = *Orph.* fr. 247 Kern), in Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* V, 12, PG 9, 116f.), and in Theodoretus (*Graec. aff. cur.* II, PG 83, 836).[29]

Highly relevant to our theme is also the *Kerygma Petri* (fr. 2 Klostermann) as quoted by Clement of Alexandria at *Strom.* VI, 5, PG 9, 257ff.: γινώσκετε οὖν ὅτι εἷς θεός ἐστιν, ὃς ἀρχὴν πάντων ἐποίησεν, καὶ τέλους ἐξουσίαν ἔχων ... ὁ ἀόρατος, ὃς τὰ πάντα ὁρᾷ, ἀχώρητος, ὃς τὰ πάντα χωρεῖ, ἀνεπιδεής, οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐπιδέεται καὶ δι' ὅν ἐστιν, ἀκατάληπτος, ἀέναος, ἄφθαρτος, ἀποίητος, ὃς τὰ πάντα ἐποίησεν λόγῳ δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ.[30] Whilst from the Jewish propagandizing compilation to which reference has just been made derive the following verses, ascribed by Clement (*Protr.* VI, PG 8, 173) to Euripides (fr. 1129 Nauck), and by Ps.-Justin (*De mon.* 2, PG 6, 316) to Philemon:

> θεὸν δὲ ποῖον, εἰπέ μοι, νομιστέον (νοητέον Clem. Alex.);
> τὸν πάνθ' ὁρῶντα, καὐτὸν οὐχ ὁρώμενον.

It is hardly necessary to remark that these verses should in fact be referred neither to Euripides nor to Philemon but rather to the pen of a Hellenistic Jewish forger. Again, Ignatius, *Ad Magn.* 3, 1f., contrasts God, the invisible ἐπίσκοπος πάντων, with His visible representative,

---

[28] Cf. Bousset-Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*[4] (Tübingen 1966) pp. 25f.

[29] Cf. Kern, *Orph. fr.*, pp. 255ff. See also p. 253 below.

[30] Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* I, 7, PL 6, 152, remarks that God *a Sibylla* αὐτογενὴς, *et* ἀγέννητος, *et* ἀποίητος *nominatur*. As J. Geffcken notes (*Komposition und Entstehungszeit der Oracula Sibyllina* (Leipzig 1902) p. 74), the term ἀποίητος occurs nowhere in the extant *Sibyllina*. Perhaps Lactantius had in mind the closely related fr. 2 of the *Kerygma Petri*.

the ἐπίσκοπος of the Magnesians: εἰς τιμὴν οὖν ἐκείνου τοῦ θελήσαντος ἡμᾶς (sc. θεοῦ) πρέπον ἐστὶν ἐπακούειν κατὰ μηδεμίαν ὑπόκρισιν· ἐπεὶ οὐχ ὅτι τὸν ἐπίσκοπον τοῦτον τὸν βλεπόμενον πλανᾷ τις, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀόρατον παραλογίζεται. τὸ δὲ τοιοῦτον οὐ πρὸς σάρκα ὁ λόγος, ἀλλὰ πρὸς θεὸν τὸν τὰ κρύφια εἰδότα. Another Christian variant on this Jewish theme occurs in the *Apology* of Aristides (IV, 1 = *Barl. et Joas.* 27, PG 96, 1109): ὅς (sc. θεός) ἐστιν ἄφθαρτός τε καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος καὶ ἀόρατος· αὐτὸς δὲ πάντα ὁρᾷ, καὶ, καθὼς βούλεται, ἀλλοιοῖ καὶ μεταβάλλει.

Peculiarly relevant to our discussion is also the final prayer of the *Anonymous Gnostic Writing* (c. 22) of the *Codex Brucianus*, in particular the following (GCS, *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften* I, p. 366, 29 ff.): "Er ist der Keim aller Güter (ἀγαθά), er ist auch schwanger von ihnen allen, der Selbstentstandene (αὐτοφυής) oder (ἢ) der alleinige Spross, der vor dem All existiert, der sich allein gezeugt hat, der zu jeder Zeit existiert. Ein Selbstgezeugter (αὐτογέννητος) und Ewiger ist er, der keinen Namen hat und dem alle Namen gehören, der eher erkennt als das All, der das All betrachtet (θεωρεῖν) und auf das All blickt, der das All erhört, der mächtiger ist als (παρά) alle Kräfte, in dessen unbegreifliches Gesicht niemand schauen kann."

The Hellenistic Jewish liturgical material in Books VII and VIII of the *Constitutiones apostolicae*[31] contains much that is pertinent to our inquiry. See, e.g., *Const. apost.* VIII, 5, PG 1, 1073[32]: Ὁ ὤν, δέσποτα, κύριε, ὁ θεὸς, ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ μόνος ἀγέννητος, καὶ ἀβασίλευτος· ὁ ἀεὶ ὤν, καὶ πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων ὑπάρχων· ὁ παντὶ ἀνενδεὴς, καὶ πάσης αἰτίας καὶ γενέσεως κρείττων· ὁ μόνος ἀληθινὸς, ὁ μόνος σοφός· ὁ ὢν μόνος ὕψιστος· ὁ τῇ φύσει ἀόρατος· οὗ ἡ γνῶσις ἄναρχος· ὁ μόνος ἀγαθὸς, καὶ ἀσύγκριτος, ὁ τὰ πάντα εἰδὼς πρὶν γενέσεως αὐτῶν· ὁ τῶν κρυπτῶν γνώστης· κτλ. And further *ibid.* VIII, 15, PG 1, 1112 f.[33]: Ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ ἀληθινὸς καὶ ἀσύγκριτος, ὁ πανταχοῦ ὢν καὶ τοῖς πᾶσι παρὼν καὶ ἐν οὐδενὶ ὡς ἑνόν τι ὑπάρχων, ὁ τόποις μὴ περιγραφόμενος, ὁ χρόνοις μὴ παλαιούμενος, ὁ αἰῶσι μὴ περατούμενος, ὁ λόγοις μὴ παραγόμενος, ὁ γενέσει μὴ ὑποκείμενος, ὁ φυλακῆς μὴ δεόμενος, ὁ φθορᾶς ἀνώτερος, ὁ τροπῆς ἀνεπίδεκτος, ὁ φύσει ἀναλ-

[31] Cf. W. Bousset, *Eine jüdische Gebetssammlung im siebenten Buch der apostolischen Konstitutionen*, Nachr. d. K. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl. 1915, Nr. 3, pp. 435 ff.; E. R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light* (rp. Amsterdam 1969) pp. 306 ff.

[32] Cf. Bousset, *op. cit.*, pp. 479 ff.

[33] Cf. Bousset, *op. cit.*, pp. 478 f.

λοίωτος, ὁ φῶς οἰκῶν ἀπρόσιτον, ὁ τῇ φύσει ἀόρατος, ὁ γνωστὸς πάσαις ταῖς μετ' εὐνοίας ἐκζητούσαις σε λογικαῖς φύσεσιν, ὁ καταλαμβανόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν εὐνοίᾳ ἐπιζητούντων σε· ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ, τοῦ ἀληθινῶς ὁρῶντος, τοῦ [εἰς Χριστὸν πιστεύσαντος][34] λαοῦ σου.

The interpretation of the name Ἰσραήλ as ὁ ὁρῶν θεόν = רֹאֵה אֵל אִישׁ also occurs at *Const. apost.* VII, 36, PG 1, 1032, and is familiar from Philo (cf., e.g., *De mut. nom.* 81: ὁ δὲ Ἰσραὴλ ὁρῶν τὸν θεὸν καλεῖται)[35] and a wide range of more or less contemporary sources.[36] It is particularly fascinating to meet this etymology in the context of the above prayer, because it represents there a reaction against the conception of the deity as τὸν πάντα ὁρῶντα καὶ μὴ ὁρώμενον. God is not absolutely invisible, but makes Himself known to those who approach Him in the proper spirit, and in particular to His chosen people, τὸ ὁρατικὸν γένος (cf. Philo, *De mut. nom.* 109).[37]

In the NT this latter theme is apparent at, e.g., Matt. 5. 8 (μακάριοι οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ, ὅτι αὐτοὶ τὸν θεὸν ὄψονται), and Hebrews 12, 14 (εἰρήνην διώκετε μετὰ πάντων, καὶ τὸν ἁγιασμόν, οὗ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν κύριον). Also the seemingly ambiguous Hebrews 11, 27 (τὸν γὰρ ἀόρατον ὡς ὁρῶν ἐκαρτέρησεν) should probably be interpreted as indicating that the Invisible did in fact make Himself visible to Moses. At any rate, taking into account the nature of the Hellenistic situation, I cannot accept the view of W. Michaelis that,[38] "The author is not interested in the question whether Moses ever saw God or not". Of especial interest, however, is I John 4, 7f.: πᾶς ὁ ἀγαπῶν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται καὶ γινώσκει τὸν θεόν. ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν οὐκ ἔγνω τὸν θεόν, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν.[39] For the prevalence in the Middle Platonic period of the view, particularly associated with the Pythagoreans, that τῷ ὁμοίῳ τὸ ὅμοιον γνωρίζεται (Albinus, *Didasc.* 14, p. 169 Hermann) see J. H. Waszink on Calcidius, *In Tim.* 51, p. 100, 10ff. It should be noted further that the doctrine is specifically linked with the problem of

[34] A Christian interpolation.

[35] For further references see H. Leisegang, *Der heilige Geist* (Leipzig-Berlin 1919) p. 224 n. 3.

[36] Cf., e.g., Melito, *De Pascha* 603ff. For further examples see O. Perler's commentary (*Sources Chrétiennes*, 123) thereon.

[37] More references in Leisegang, *op. cit.*, p. 223 n. 4.

[38] *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* V (Grand Rapids 1967) p. 369 n. 9.

[39] Cf. III John 11 ὁ κακοποιῶν οὐχ ἑώρακεν τὸν θεόν.

knowledge of God in the *Anonymous Commentary on the Parmenides*,[40] fol. IV, 21 ff.:

> [ἡμεῖς] καὶ πάντα τὰ ὄντα τὸ μη‹δέ›ν ἐσμεν πρὸς αὐτόν. δι' ἣν αἰτίαν οὐκ ἐχώρει τὸ γνῶναι αὐτόν, ὅτι μηδέν ἐστιν πάντα τὰ ἄλλα πρὸς αὐτόν, αἱ δὲ γνώσεις τῷ ὁμοίῳ αἱροῦσι τὸ ὅμοιον.

Thus it is only by becoming like God that man can gain knowledge of Him. This point is stressed at *Corpus Hermeticum* XI, 20 (I, 155, 11 ff. N-F): ἐὰν οὖν μὴ σεαυτὸν ἐξισάσῃς τῷ θεῷ, τὸν θεὸν νοῆσαι οὐ δύνασαι· τὸ γὰρ ὅμοιον τῷ ὁμοίῳ νοητόν. Cf. also Plotinus, *Enn.* I, 6, 9, 32 ff. H-S: γενέσθω δὴ πρῶτον θεοειδὴς πᾶς καὶ καλὸς πᾶς, εἰ μέλλει θεάσασθαι θεόν τε καὶ καλόν. The same view seems to be reflected at I John 3, 2: οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἐὰν φανερωθῇ ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα, ὅτι ὀψόμεθα αὐτὸν καθώς ἐστιν.[41]

Whilst such statements are in accord with the claim made at Ps. 17, 15 that God will indeed reveal Himself to His righteous servant, Exodus 33, 20 had ascribed to God the emphatic assertion that Οὐ δυνήσῃ ἰδεῖν μου τὸ πρόσωπον· οὐ γὰρ μὴ ἴδῃ ἄνθρωπος τὸ πρόσωπόν μου καὶ ζήσεται.[42] This latter view receives frequent emphasis in the NT; cf., e.g., John 1, 18 (θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε), 6, 46; I John 4, 12 (θεὸν οὐδεὶς πώποτε τεθέαται), 4, 20; I Tim. 6, 16 (ὃν εἶδεν οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ ἰδεῖν δύναται). However, the strictness of this conception is often modified or neutralized by the contrary claim that the Son is the mediator of the divine vision; cf., e.g., Matt. 11, 27 (οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι); John 1, 18 (ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο (sc. τὸν θεόν)), 12, 45 (ὁ θεωρῶν ἐμὲ θεωρεῖ τὸν πέμψαντά με), 14, 9 (ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμὲ ἑώρακεν τὸν πατέρα).

In interpreting Hellenistic pronouncements such as the above regarding man's ability to "see" the deity, one must bear in mind that such terms as ὁράω, θεωρέω, θεάομαι are ambiguous in that they may refer to

---

[40] Ed. by W. Kroll, Ein neuplatonischer Parmenidescommentar in einem Turiner Palimpsest, *Rheinisches Museum* 47 (1892) 599 ff. New edition and commentary by P. Hadot in his *Porphyre et Victorinus* II (Paris 1968) pp. 59 ff.

[41] Cf. also II Corinth. 3, 18.

[42] For the OT background see E. Fascher, Deus invisibilis, *Marburger Theologische Studien* I (1931), pp. 41 ff.; W. Michaelis' contributions, s.vv. ὁράω *et sim.*, to Kittel-Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* V (English Trans. Grand Rapids 1967).

mental apprehension as well as to physical sensation.[43] There is no doubt that in the heat of the Hellenistic debate this distinction frequently became blurred or was left completely out of account. On the other hand it was often emphasized (usually in dependence upon Plato, *Tim.* 28 A 1f.: νοήσει μετὰ λόγου περιληπτόν) that though God is inaccessible to the physical eye,[44] He may be grasped by νοῦς or λόγος, the divine element in man.[45] Thus our Jewish propagandizing source quotes the Ps.-Orphic fragment to which reference was made above[46] as follows:

οὐδέ τις αὐτὸν
εἰσοράᾳ θνητῶν, αὐτὸς δέ γε πάντας ὁρᾶται.

In Ps.-Aristobulus' version,[47] however, we read:

οὐδέ τις αὐτὸν
εἰσοράᾳ ψυχῶν θνητῶν, νῷ δ' εἰσοράαται.

Cf. also the Neopythagorean Ps.-Onatas *ap.* Stobaeus, *Anth.* I, p. 48, 12f. Wachsmuth: ὁ μὲν ὢν θεὸς αὐτὸς οὔτε ὁρατὸς οὔτε αἰσθητός, ἀλλὰ λόγῳ μόνον καὶ νόῳ θεωρατός. It is interesting that Seneca makes the same point in connection with the Stoic conception[48] of the self-production of the deity at *Quaest. nat.* VII, 30, 3: *Quam multa praeter hos* (sc. cometas) *per secretum eunt numquam humanis oculis orientia! Neque enim omnia deus homini fecit. Quota pars operis tanti nobis committitur? Ipse qui ista tractat, qui condidit, qui totum hoc fundavit deditque circa se, maiorque est pars sui operis ac melior, effugit oculos; cogitatione visendus est.* The same theme occurs again, but with a significant addition (cf. Matt. 5, 8), at *C.H.* VII, 2 (I, 81, 16f. N-F): οὐ γάρ ἐστιν (sc. ὁ θεὸς) ἀκουστός, οὐδὲ λεκτός, οὐδὲ ὁρατὸς ὀφθαλμοῖς, ἀλλὰ νῷ καὶ

[43] Cf. Michaelis, *op. cit.* (see previous footnote).

[44] Cf. the Hermetic *Exc. Stob.* I, 2 (III, 3 N-F): ὀφθαλμοῖς μὲν γὰρ τὰ σώματα θεατά, γλώττῃ δὲ τὰ ὁρατὰ λεκτά· τὸ δὲ ἀσώματον καὶ ἀφανὲς καὶ ἀσχημάτιστον καὶ μηδὲ ἐξ ὕλης ὑποκείμενον ὑπὸ τῶν ἡμετέρων αἰσθήσεων καταληφθῆναι οὐ δύναται. ἐννοοῦμαι, ὦ Τάτ, ἐννοοῦμαι· ὃ ἐξειπεῖν ἀδύνατον, τοῦτό ἐστιν ὁ θεός. The underlined phrase is a reminiscence of a popular misquotation of the Platonic commonplace *Tim.* 28 C 3ff.: τὸν μὲν οὖν ποιητὴν καὶ πατέρα τοῦδε τοῦ παντὸς εὑρεῖν τε ἔργον καὶ εὑρόντα εἰς πάντας ἀδύνατον λέγειν. Cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Protr.* VI, PG 8, 172, and *Strom.* V, 12, PG 9, 116; Cyril of Alexandria, *Adv. Iul.* I, PG 76, 548; Zacharias of Mytilene, *De opific.*, PG 85, 1089.

[45] A. S. Pease on Cicero, *N.D.* I, 49 (*non sensu sed mente cernatur*) has gathered many references (though his list is far from exhaustive) to illustrate the commonplace nature of this theme.

[46] Cf. pp. 248f. above.

[47] Cf. p. 249 above.

[48] Cf. footnote 23 above.

καρδίᾳ. With this one may compare Origen, *Contra Cels.* VI, 69, PG 11, 1404: ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ θεὸς καθ' ἡμᾶς τῷ μὲν μὴ εἶναι σῶμα ἀόρατός ἐστιν· τοῖς δὲ θεωρητικοῖς καρδίᾳ θεωρητὸς, τουτέστι νῷ· καρδίᾳ δὲ οὐ τῇ τυχούσῃ, ἀλλὰ τῇ καθαρᾷ· οὐ γὰρ θέμις μεμολυσμένην καρδίαν ἐνορᾶν θεῷ, ἀλλὰ δεῖ καθαρὸν εἶναι τὸ τοῦ καθαροῦ κατ' ἀξίαν θεωρητικόν.

Elsewhere Origen emphasizes the role of the Son (λόγος) as mediator. Thus at *Contra Cels.* VI, 65, PG 11, 1397 Origen criticizes Celsus' view that God is οὐδὲ λόγῳ ἐφικτός (a polemical rejection, or better, exaggeration, of *Tim.* 28 A 1f.[49]): ἐπεὶ δέ φησιν, ὅτι, "οὐδὲ λόγῳ ἐφικτός·" διαστέλλομαι τὸ σημαινόμενον, καί φημι, εἰ μὲν λόγῳ τῷ ἐν ἡμῖν, εἴτε ἐνδιαθέτῳ, εἴτε καὶ προφορικῷ· καὶ ἡμεῖς φήσομεν, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἐφικτὸς τῷ λόγῳ ὁ θεός· εἰ δὲ, νοήσαντες τὸ, "'Εν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος·" ἀποφαινόμεθα, ὅτι τούτῳ τῷ λόγῳ ἐφικτός ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς, οὐ μόνῳ αὐτῷ καταλαμβανόμενος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἀποκαλύψῃ τὸν πατέρα, ψευδοποιήσομεν τὴν Κέλσου λέξιν, φάσκοντος· Οὐδὲ λόγῳ ἐφικτός ἐστιν ὁ θεός.

[49] However, according to Origin, *Contra Cels.* VII, 45, PG 11, 1488, Celsus also claimed that God was ἀρρήτῳ τινὶ δυνάμει νοητός. The extremist view also appears in Philo at *De leg. spec.* II, 165 (ὁ ἀνωτάτω πατὴρ θεῶν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων καὶ τοῦ σύμπαντος κόσμου δημιουργός, οὗ τὴν φύσιν ἀόρατον καὶ δυστόπαστον οὖσαν οὐ μόνον ὁραθῆναι ἀλλὰ καὶ νοηθῆναι πάντες οἱ περὶ τὰ μαθήματα καὶ τὴν ἄλλην φιλοσοφίαν διατρίβοντες ἀναζητεῖν γλίχονται); cf. too *ibid.* I, 36ff.: ἄμεινον γὰρ οὐδὲν τοῦ ζητεῖν τὸν ἀληθῆ θεόν, κἂν ἡ εὕρεσις αὐτοῦ διαφεύγῃ δύναμιν ἀνθρωπίνην, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἡ περὶ τὸ βούλεσθαι μαθεῖν σπουδὴ καθ' αὑτὴν ἀλέκτους ἡδονὰς καὶ εὐφροσύνας ἐργάζεται. κτλ. Lactantius, *Div. inst.* I, 8, PL 6, 153, conflates this extremist view with *Tim.* 28 C 3ff.: *cuius* (sc. dei) *vim maiestatemque tantam esse dicit in Timaeo Plato, ut eam neque mente concipere, neque verbis enarrare quisquam possit, ob nimiam eius et inaestimabilem potestatem.* As E. Norden (*Agnostos Theos* (rp. Darmstadt 1956) p. 84 n. 2) pointed out, Lactantius' closing words (which have no counterpart in the *Timaeus*) have been borrowed from Minucius Felix' paraphrase of *Tim.* 28 C at *Oct.* 19, 14, PL 3, 296: *quem et invenire difficile, prae nimia et incredibili potestate; et, cum inveneris, in publicum dicere impossibile praefatur.* There is no need to suppose, as does A. Wlosok (*Laktanz und die philosophische Gnosis* (Heidelberg 1960) p. 226), that the formulation of Minucius Felix was in turn directly influenced by Apuleius, *De deo Socr.* 3: *cum Plato ... frequentissime praedicet hunc solum maiestatis incredibili quadam nimietate et ineffabili non posse penuria sermonis humani quavis oratione vel modice comprehendi,* etc. Minucius and Apuleius may well have been independently influenced by a Greek source which conflated *Tim.* 28 C and *Rep.* 509 B 9f.: ἔτι ἐπέκεινα τῆς οὐσίας πρεσβείᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ὑπερέχοντος. Cf. also Lactantius, *De ira.* 11, 11, PL 7, 112 (*nec mente comprehendi* (sc. deus)); and the misrepresentations of Xenophon, *Mem.* IV, 3, 13, and Plato, *Laws* 821 A at *De ira.* 11, 13, PL 7, 112f. A. D. Nock (The exegesis of Timaeus 28 C, *Vigiliae Christianae* 16 (1962) 79ff.) argued against the view of Dr. Wlosok that Lactantius' *neque mente concipere* reveals "Gnostic" influence. Celsus' οὐδὲ λόγῳ ἐφικτός makes it quite plain that the doctrine was in fact "schulplatonisch".

Clement of Alexandria, too, dwells upon the role of the divine λόγος, but emphasizes that divine generosity is also involved; cf. *Strom.* V, 12, PG 9, 124: ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐπιστήμῃ λαμβάνεται τῇ ἀποδεικτικῇ (sc. ὁ θεός)· αὕτη γὰρ ἐκ προτέρων καὶ γνωριμωτέρων συνίσταται, τοῦ δὲ ἀγεννήτου οὐδὲν προυπάρχει. λείπεται δὴ θείᾳ χάριτι καὶ μόνῳ τῷ παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγῳ τὸ ἄγνωστον νοεῖν. For divine generosity cf. also the Hermetic *Asclepius* 41 (II, 353 N-F): *gratias tibi summe, exsuperantissime; tua enim gratia tantum sumus cognitionis tuae lumen consecuti.*[50] Irenaeus, *Contra haer.* IV, 20, 5, PG 7, 1034f., reconciles Exodus 33, 20 with Matt. 5, 8 as follows: ... *Dominus ait: "Beati mundo corde, quoniam ipsi Deum videbunt." Sed secundum magnitudinem quidem eius, et mirabilem gloriam, "nemo videbit Deum, et vivet"; incapabilis enim Pater: secundum autem dilectionem et humanitatem, et quod omnia possit, etiam hoc concedit iis qui se diligunt, id est videre Deum, quod et prophetabant prophetae. Quoniam "quae impossibilia apud homines, possibilia apud Deum"* (Luke 18, 27). *Homo etenim a se non videt Deum. Ille autem volens videtur hominibus, quibus vult, et quando vult, et quemadmodum vult.* Rather similar is *C.H.* X, 15 (I, 120, 7f. N-F): οὐ γὰρ ἀγνοεῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὁ θεός, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάνυ γνωρίζει καὶ θέλει γνωρίζεσθαι. The same theme is also in evidence in the prayer (to which we shall presently turn) at the close of the Hermetic *Poimandres* (*C.H.* I, 31 (I, 18, 3f. N-F)): ἅγιος ὁ θεός, ὃς γνωσθῆναι βούλεται καὶ γινώσκεται τοῖς ἰδίοις. In the Budé edition Festugière translates this (correctly, I believe) as follows: "Saint est Dieu, qui veut qu'on le connaisse et qui est connu de ceux (*or* qui se fait connaître à ceux) qui lui appartiennent." For ἴδιος in the required sense cf. Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* 121, PG 6, 757: τοὺς δὲ ἰδίους ἀναπαύσει (sc. ὁ θεός), ἀποδιδοὺς αὐτοῖς τὰ προσδοκώμενα πάντα. I cannot accept the translation later suggested by Festugière[51]: "Saint est Dieu, qui veut qu'on le connaisse et qui est connu *par ses caractères propres.*" The Greek could hardly convey this meaning without the assistance of some unambiguous substantive such as appears in the preceding verse (*C.H.* I, 31 (I, 18, 1f. N-F)): ἅγιος ὁ θεός, οὗ ἡ βουλὴ τελεῖται ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων δυνάμεων.

To return to the main theme of this paper, the evidence assembled

[50] On this and the closely related prayer at PGM III, 591ff. see R. Reitzenstein, *Hellenistische Mysterienreligionen*[3] (rp. Darmstadt 1966) pp. 285ff.

[51] *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste* IV, *Le Dieu inconnu et la Gnose* (Paris 1954) p. 56.

above shows that we can hardly be wrong in ascribing a Hellenistic Jewish origin to the prayer in PGM XIII. However, this conclusion in no way implies that the use of the locution πάντων μείζων as a divine title must be considered exclusively Jewish.[52] The formula seems on the contrary to be a widespread Hellenistic type. Thus Seneca (*Ep.* 58, 17) describes God as *maior ac potentior cunctis*. That Seneca has in mind a Greek formula can be seen from *C.H.* VI, 2 (I, 73, 6 N-F) where the universe is referred to as τῷ ζῴῳ τῷ πάντων μείζονι καὶ δυνατωτάτῳ.[53] The Hermetic *Poimandres* presents, in the final prayer just referred to above, a variation on the formula which carries the thought a step further in negative theological direction and is intended, perhaps, to put new life into a commonplace theme[54] (*C.H.* I, 31 (I, 18, 8 ff. N-F)):

ἅγιος εἶ, ὁ πάσης δυνάμεως ἰσχυρότερος.
ἅγιος εἶ, ὁ πάσης ὑπεροχῆς μείζων.
ἅγιος εἶ, ὁ κρειττων τῶν ἐπαίνων.

The popularity of the prayer (*C.H.* I, 31 f.) from which these lines are taken may be judged from its presence *in toto* in a Christian prayer-book (P. Berol. 9794)[55] dating from the late third century after Christ, and from the occurrence on an amulet in the British Museum (No. 56489)[56] of the following formula: ὁ μείζων τῆς ὑπεροχῆς, ὁ τῆς δυνάμεως ἰσχυρότερος, ὁ τῶν ἐνκομίων κρείσσων, μενναθ.[57]

The full connotation of the words ὁ πάσης ὑπεροχῆς μείζων at *C.H.* I, 31 is, I think, perhaps not captured by Festugière's translation in the Budé edition: "... toi qui es plus grand que toute excellence." The use of ὑπεροχή in the Hellenistic period is by no means limited to the expression of transcendency. In fact, the term is commonly used to indicate political power or supremacy, as may be seen from LSJ[9] s.v. II, 3. Cf., e.g., I Tim. 2, 2: ὑπὲρ βασιλέων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων. Moreover,

[52] For a LXX counterpart cf. *Soph. Sir.* 43, 28: ὁ μέγας παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.

[53] Probably a Stoic-pantheistic transference of a divine title from the transcendent god to the universe. For Stoic ambivalence in this regard cf. Seneca, *Quaest. nat.* I, *praef.* 13: *Quid est deus? mens universi. quid est deus? quod vides totum et quod non vides totum. sic demum magnitudo illi sua redditur, qua nihil maius excogitari potest, si solus est omnia, si opus suum et intra et extra tenet.*

[54] On the tendency towards inflation in negative theological terminology see my paper Basilides on the ineffability of God, *Harvard Theological Review* 62 (1969) 367 ff.

[55] Cf. Nock-Festugière *ad* C.H. I, 31 f.

[56] Edited by C. Bonner in his Liturgical fragments on Gnostic amulets, *Harvard Theological Review* 25 (1932) 362 ff.

[57] Possibly also P. Berol. 9794 read τῆς ὑπεροχῆς rather than πάσης ὑπεροχῆς; cf. C. Bonner, *op. cit.*, p. 365.

also μείζων is frequently employed in the Hellenistic age of persons in authority; cf. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch d. griech. Pap.*, s.v. In consequence of this I would interpret ὁ πάσης ὑπεροχῆς μείζων as indicating not merely transcendency but also that the deity is more powerful than any authority, i.e., King of kings. It should be noted that appellations of this type are particularly widespread in the Hellenistic period. Instances abound in the LXX; cf. e.g., Deut. 10, 17 (θεὸς τῶν θεῶν καὶ κύριος τῶν κυρίων), Ps. 88, 28 (ὑψηλὸν παρὰ τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν τῆς γῆς), Daniel 2, 47 (θεὸς τῶν θεῶν καὶ κύριος τῶν βασιλέων), II Macc. 13, 4 (ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλέων). NT instances are I Tim. 6, 15 (ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλευόντων καὶ κύριος τῶν κυριευόντων), and Rev. 1, 5 (ὁ ἄρχων τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς).[58] Cf. further Philo, *De leg. spec.* I, 18 (βασιλεὺς βασιλέων), *ibid.* I, 20 (θεὸς θεῶν), Diodorus Sic. I, 47, 4 (βασιλεὺς βασιλέων Ὀσυμανδύας εἰμί), *ibid.* I, 55, 7 (βασιλεὺς βασιλέων καὶ δεσπότης δεσποτῶν Σεσόωσις), Plotinus, *Enn.* V, 5, 3, 20 H-S (βασιλεὺς βασιλέως καὶ βασιλέων). And for a veritable proliferation of such formulations see the *Anonymous Gnostic Writing* (c. 22) of the *Codex Brucianus* (GCS, *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften* I, p. 366, 14ff.): "Dies ist der ⟨Vater⟩ aller Väter und ⟨der Gott⟩ aller Götter und ⟨der Herr⟩ aller Herren und ⟨der Sohn⟩ aller Söhne ⟨und⟩ der Erlöser (σωτήρ) ⟨aller⟩ Erlöser (σωτῆρες) und der Unsichtbare (ἀόρατος) aller Unsichtbaren (ἀόρατοι) und ⟨das Schweigen (σιγή)⟩ alles Schweigens (σιγαί) usw."

Certainly in the Leiden papyrus the formula πάντων μείζων is not just another Hellenistic variation on the theme of the immensity and infinity of the supreme deity. Rather, a consideration of literary and liturgical parallels to the opening of the prayer – ἐπικαλοῦμαί σε τὸν πάντων μείζονα, τὸν πάντα κτίσαντα – reveals that the formula in question refers specifically to the status of the primary God as ruler of the universe: God is invoked not only as creator of the universe (τὸν πάντα κτίσαντα) but also as king thereof (τὸν πάντων μείζονα). Thus, at the opening of a Hellenistic Jewish prayer[59] God is invoked as δέσποτα τῶν ὅλων, κτίστα καὶ πρύτανι τῶν πάντων (*Const. apost.* VIII, 9, PG 1, 1084). Cf. also the opening of the sacrificial prayer at II Macc 1, 24 (Κύριε, κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ πάντων κτίστης ... ὁ μόνος βασιλεὺς κτλ.) and likewise III Macc. 2, 3 (σὺ γὰρ ὁ κτίσας τὰ πάντα καὶ τῶν ὅλων ἐπικρατῶν δυνάστης δίκαιος εἶ); Judith 9, 12 (δέσποτα τῶν οὐρανῶν

[58] Cf. also Rev. 17, 14 and 18; 19, 16.

[59] Cf. Bousset, *op. cit.* (footnote 31 above), p. 482.

καὶ τῆς γῆς, κτίστα τῶν ὑδάτων, βασιλεῦ πάσης κτίσεώς σου) and II Esdras 19, 6 (Σὺ εἶ αὐτὸς κύριος μόνος· σὺ ἐποίησας τὸν οὐρανον κτλ.). It is interesting to note that Philo's division of God's power into δύναμις ποιητική and δύναμις βασιλική[60] simply integrates a pre-existent liturgical theme into a theological system.

This emphasis upon God as both creator and ruler is equally evident in early Christian texts. In the NT, for example, we meet it at Acts 4, 24 (δέσποτα, σὺ ὁ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς) and 17, 24 (ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιήσας τὸν κόσμον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ, οὗτος οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς ὑπάρχων κύριος). Again, Justin speaks of τὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ δεσπότου θεοῦ ὄνομα (I *Ap.* 61, PG 6, 421) and of τοῦ πατρὸς πάντων καὶ δεσπότου θεοῦ υἱός (I *Ap.* 12, PG 6, 345),[61] whilst a poem of Gregory Nazianzen opens thus (PG 37, 514f.):

> Σοὶ χάρις, ὦ πάντων βασιλεῦ, πάντων δὲ ποιητά.[62]

Particularly remarkable is *Ep. ad Diogn.* VII, 2 (ὁ παντοκράτωρ καὶ παντοκτίστης καὶ ἀόρατος θεός) which, like the prayer in the Leiden papyrus, combines the theme of ruling and creative power with that of the invisibility of God.

The designation of the supreme divinity as both creator and ruler is by no means peculiarly Judaeo-Christian. Already Terpander writes (fr. 1 Diehl) Ζεῦ πάντων ἀρχά, πάντων ἀγήτωρ. And Heraclitus seems to be reflecting liturgical usage when he says of πόλεμος that (fr. 53 Diels-Kranz) πάντων μὲν πατήρ ἐστι, πάντων δὲ βασιλεύς. Justin speaks of αὐτὸν τὸν ἡγεμόνα καὶ γεννήτορα πάντων κατ' αὐτοὺς (sc. the Greeks) Δία (I *Ap.* 21, PG 6, 361), with which we may compare Ps.-Aristotle, *De mundo* 399 a 30f. (ὁ πάντων ἡγεμών τε καὶ γενέτωρ, ἀόρατος ὢν ἄλλῳ πλὴν λογισμῷ), where once again the theme of regal and creative power is combined with the conception of the invisible deity (adjusted

---

[60] Cf. Goodenough, *op. cit.* (footnote 31 above), pp. 25ff.

[61] There is an interesting variation on the common type at *Acta Joannis* 112 (II[1], 212, 1f. Lipsius-Bonnet): ὁ τῶν ὑπερουρανίων πατήρ· ὁ τῶν ἐπουρανίων δεσπότης. Cf. *Acta Thomae* 30 (II[11], 147, 9ff. L-B): δέσποτα πάντων καὶ πατήρ· πατὴρ δὲ οὐ τῶν ἐν σώμασιν οὐσῶν ψυχῶν ἀλλὰ τῶν ἐξελθουσῶν· τῶν γὰρ ἐν μιάσμασιν οὐσῶν ψυχῶν δεσπότης εἶ καὶ δικαστής.

[62] Cf. further, e.g., Boethius, *De cons.* III, 6:
Unus enim rerum pater est, unus cuncta ministrat.
Ille dedit Phoebo radios, dedit et cornua lunae, etc.

in the light of *Timaeus* 28 A 1 f.). And Apuleius makes Isis reveal herself to Lucius as *rerum naturae parens, elementorum omnium*[63] *domina* (*Metam.* XI, 5).

These examples indicate clearly the connotation of the formula πάντων μείζων in the context of the Hellenistic Jewish prayer preserved in the Leiden papyrus. It remains for us to consider the relevance of all the evidence accumulated above to the locution as it presents itself in John 10, 29. Since it appears in such widely disparate sources as the Leiden papyrus, Seneca, the *Hermetica*, and John, the formula in question was clearly fairly commonly used in the Hellenistic period to describe the status of the supreme divinity. However, the evidence does not entitle us to conclude that the locution possessed in every instance the same connotation. Thus, in the Leiden papyrus the phrase demonstrably refers to the ruling power which the God to whom the prayer is addressed is presumed to exercise over the universe; i.e., πάντων refers (as is in general the case in Hellenistic ἐπικλήσεις) specifically to the created universe in its entirety. But at *C.H.* VI, 2 (I, 73, 6 N-F) (αὐτῷ τῷ ζώῳ τῷ πάντων μείζονι καὶ δυνατωτάτῳ), since the ζῷον is identical with the physical universe, πάντων can hardly refer to the totality of created things. In fact in this instance πάντων seems to be used either in much the same vague sort of way as in such expressions as πρὸ πάντων (cf., e.g., I Peter 4, 8) or πάντων μάλιστα (cf., e.g., Aristotle, *Metaph.* 1079 b 12), or else to indicate the superiority of the universe, itself a ζῷον, to all other ζῷα; cf. *Apoc. Mos.* 16 (p. 8 Tisch.) where the διάβολος says of the serpent εὗρον δὲ σέ μείζονα πάντων τῶν θηρίων, and likewise the parable of the mustard-seed (Mark 4, 32): γίνεται μεῖζον πάντων τῶν λαχάνων. Again, a certain ambiguity attaches to the term μείζων, which in John 10, 29 might signify not so much ruling power as more generally the Father's superiority to, or transcendency over, the created universe or, more vaguely, "everything".[64] Johannine usage[65] and also the context suggest the former interpretation, but the obvious parallelism of John 3, 31 (ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν.

---

[63] For the fanciful interpretation of πάντα (= the physical universe) as a derivative of πέντε (= the five elements – ether, fire, air, water, earth) cf. Plutarch, *De Iside* 374 A: καὶ τὰ πάντα τῶν πέντε γέγονε παρώνυμα.

[64] On the relevant meanings of μέγας see Grundmann's contribution s.v. in Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* IV (English trans. Grand Rapids 1967).

[65] Cf. Grundmann's *op. cit.*

κτλ.) speaks strongly in favour of regarding πάντων μείζων as indicative not only of ruling power but also of transcendency.[66]

However, looking aside from this latter question of the more precise connotation of πάντων μείζων in John 10, 29, the above evidence makes it apparent that since the formula was commonly applied to the supreme deity in the Hellenistic period its liturgical flavour is likely to have been familiar to the author of John. Such being the case, it is unreasonable to suppose – following Barrett – that the evangelist should have inexplicably and ungrammatically substituted the neuter form μεῖζον for the familiar μείζων.[67]

St. John's, Memorial University of Newfoundland

[66] For the meaning of ἐπάνω πάντων see Arndt-Bauer-Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* s.v. ἐπάνω 2. b.

[67] For information regarding the Coptic versions of the NT I am greatly indebted to Richard H. Pierce of the University of Bergen.